



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/610,983	07/06/2000	Hiroyasu Sugano	21.1962	4791

21171 7590 06/04/2003

STAAS & HALSEY LLP  
700 11TH STREET, NW  
SUITE 500  
WASHINGTON, DC 20001

EXAMINER

ENG, DAVID Y

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2155

DATE MAILED: 06/04/2003

sp

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

2

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/610,983

Applicant(s)

SUGANO ET AL.

Examiner

DAVID Y. ENG

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 July 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 July 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All   b) ☐ Some \*   c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 2155

✓ A new title more aptly descriptive of the nature and gist of the technical disclosure is requested.

✓ The drawings are objected to because the drawings are crowded with legends in two different languages and legend pointers. The legends should be in English only and located inside the rectangular boxes to eliminate pointers. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claims 1-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

---

There is no relationship recited between the reference time and the condition information. It is therefore not seen how freshness of the condition information can be determined from the reference time. See claim 1 for example. Other claims have similar defect.

It is not clear what a display mode is. See line 12 of claim 1 for example. Applicants are suggested to use "level of freshness of the condition information". Other claims have similar defect.

In dependent claim 2, the reference time is not used of determining freshness as recited in parent claim 1.

It is not clear what "line widths of figure data" are. See claim 5 for example.

Other claims have similar defects set forth above.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2155

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ouchi (6,553,407) in view of Vlsser (5,809,446).

With respect to claims 1-4, 8-15, see at least Figure 2 in Ouchi. Ouchi teaches a system having devices including hand-held devices (see line 61 of column 17) for exchanging information with other devices via a network (see network interfaces). The information may relate to condition of a user, such as whether the user is on vacation (see line 29 of column 19 and line 11 of column 20). The system also includes a display and graphical user interface for displaying transmitted information. Ouchi does not teach displaying of time elapsed from receiving the information. It is well known that freshness of anything is dependent on time elapsed. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to display elapsed time for indicating freshness of transmitted information. Graphical circuit for displaying time differences is well known in the art. See lines 52—54 of column 4 in Vlsser. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the teaching of Vlsser for determining the time difference of two signals in Ouchi so that freshness of received information can be indicated to a user in Ouchi.

With respect to claims 16-20, Ouchi also teaches automatic forwarding. See line 7 of column 20.

Claims 21-35 do not teach the invention claimed in claims 1-20 and are therefore rejected for the same reasons.

Art Unit: 2155

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by

Ouchi.

See MPEP section 2114. Ouchi teaches a display. Graphical user interface is inherent.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'David Y. Eng', with a stylized, flowing script.

DAVID Y. ENG  
PRIMARY EXAMINER